



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,143	03/15/2001	Lisa Kajisa	2719.2018-001	5798

33880 7590 11/15/2002

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742

EXAMINER

FREDMAN, JEFFREY NORMAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1637

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2002

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/811,143	Applicant(s) KAJISA ET AL.	
	Examiner Jeffrey Fredman	Art Unit 1637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sambrook et al (Molecular Cloning, A laboratory Manual, (1989) 1.98-1.99)

Sambrook teaches a method of preparing a nucleic acid on a substantially planar solid support, here a nitrocellulose filter (page 1.98) comprising:

a) attaching a plurality of nucleic acids to the support to form an array (page 1.98), (It is noted that the colonies which are bound to the nitrocellulose filter comprise nucleic acids which are isolated by the method and then bound in situ to the filter),

b) drying said array by exposing to a dry atmosphere for a period of at least 30 seconds (See page 1.99, where the filters are dried at room temperature then baked in a vacuum oven for 1-2 hours at 80 C, which is inherently a dry atmosphere as broadly interpreted since the heat drives off the water vapor but the vacuum is imperfect and permits some atmosphere to remain).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 1637

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torrence in view of Synthesis cycle 10hpaf3 (ABI 380B manual, Nov. 1989) and further in view of Yeung et al (Anal. Biochem. (1990) 18:66-75) and further in view of McGall et al (U.S. Patent 6,147,205).

Torrence teaches a method of preparing a nucleic acid on a solid support (column 11, line lines 34-45) comprising:

a) attaching a plurality of nucleic acids to the support to form an array (column 11, lines 34-42), (It is noted that the claim does not require the nucleic acids to be different from one another, nor spaced in any particular manner, so the antisense molecules synthesized on the ABI 391 as taught by Torrence represent a plurality of identical nucleic acids attached to a support which form an array),

Art Unit: 1637

b) drying said array by exposing to a dry atmosphere for a period of at least 30 seconds (See column 11, lines 42-44 where Torrence dries the oligonucleotide for 60 seconds with anhydrous argon).

Torrence teaches synthesis of an oligonucleotide in the range of 5 to 50 nucleotides (see figure 8) where the drying follows a portion of the cycles, here the final cycle, with a drying time of at least 50 seconds, here 60 seconds (column 11, lines 34-45).

Torrence does not teach synthesis where every cycle is flushed with argon for an extended period of time.

The ABI Manual, synthesis cycle 10hpaf3, teaches a cycle in which argon flushing occurs repeatedly in 100% of the cycle coupling steps (where the reverse flush shown in step numbers 18, 24, 26, 31, 50, 52 and 55 each represent a drying of the support using argon as the flushing agent) Further, the examiner notes that there is an additional 2.5 second delay inherent in the operation of the ABI 380B apparatus, yielding a complete drying time during the cycle of 35 seconds for any one step, and a combined drying time of 185 seconds for the 7 steps listed.

Yeung also demonstrates, in table I, the use of a reverse flush with argon in an ABI 380A synthesizer for 60 seconds at step 101 (page 67).

Torrence in view of Synthesis cycle and further in view of Yeung do not teach the masking and photoremovable synthesis method nor do they teach 100,000 different nucleic acid sequences being synthesized in a region less than 1 square millimeter.

Art Unit: 1637

McGall teaches a method of nucleic acid synthesis using photoremovable synthesis and masking (column 2, line 57 to column 3, line 19) comprising

(a) activating a region of the support (column 2, line 58)

(b) binding a molecule to the region, said molecule comprising a masked reactive site linked to a photolabile protecting group such as a labeled nucleotide (column 2, line 59 to column 3, line 2 and column 6, line 62 to column 8, line 19)

(c) repeating steps (a) and (b) on other regions of the support whereby each of said other regions has bound thereto another molecule comprising a masked reactive site linked to the photolabile protecting group, wherein said another molecule may be the same or different from that used in step (b) (column 3, lines 3-8);

(d) removing the photolabile protecting group from one of the molecules bound to one of the regions of the support to provide a region bearing a molecule with an unmasked reactive site (column 3, lines 9-12)

(e) binding an additional molecule to the molecule with an unmasked reactive site (column 3, lines 13-14),

(f) repeating steps (d) and (e) on regions of the support until a desired plurality of compounds is formed from the component molecules, each compound occupying separate regions of the support (column 3, lines 15-29).

McGall expressly teaches the use of masks (column 18, line 7) as well as expressly teaching multiple reactants simultaneously applied (column 10).

Art Unit: 1637

McGall further teaches that the region can be small than 1 square millimeter (column 5, line 32) as well as that arrays may include 10^6 or more different polymers (see column 13, lines 18-26).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to dry the support using the cycle functions disclosed by the ABI manual in the method of Torrence for oligonucleotide synthesis in order to follow a standard, well designed protocol identified by the company as functional and because increased drying times would improve removal of unwanted components and improve quality of synthesis of the oligonucleotides. Specifically, an ordinary practitioner would recognize that the selection of specific flushing times for argon represents a balance between speed of the cycle versus quality of the resultant product. Increased time would be expected to slow the cycle time down but would also be expected to increase the quality of the product by removing products, such as the capping components, which can damage the nucleic acids being synthesized. Yeung provides evidence that optimization of these elements was routine in the art, as Yeung notes "We formulated the FC3 program and a procedure by which a DNA synthesizer designer or operator can use 18-base-long homopolymers of A, G, C, and T to optimize the reaction times, reagent concentrations, solvent wash conditions and the many steps in the synthesis cycle (abstract)". This optimization further supports the obviousness of the claim given that Yeung's optimized protocol, designed to minimize reagent use, still uses an argon drying step of over 60 seconds (see table I).

It would further have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to synthesize arrays using the method of McGall combined with the optimized washing conditions of 30 to 185 seconds provided by Torrence, ABI synthesis cycle 10hpa3 and Yeung since an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to optimize the method of McGall to minimize the interfering effects of mixed components upon the synthesis reaction and since as Yeung notes "We formulated the FC3 program and a procedure by which a DNA synthesizer designer or operator can use 18-base-long homopolymers of A, G, C, and T to optimize the reaction times, reagent concentrations, solvent wash conditions and the many steps in the synthesis cycle (abstract)". This optimization further supports the obviousness of the claim given that Yeung's optimized protocol, designed to minimize reagent use, still uses an argon drying step of over 60 seconds (see table I).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed October 4, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that McGall teaches away from flat supports in indicating that the solid supports are preferably spherical. As MPEP 2123 states "Disclosed examples and preferred embodiments do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. In re Susi, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971)." MPEP 2123 also states "A reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.

Art Unit: 1637

1989).” It is clear that simply because McGall had a preferred embodiment, this embodiment does not prevent the use of alternative embodiments or constitute a teaching away from such embodiments such as the use of a planar surface expressly taught by McGall in column 15, lines 14-15.

Applicant argues that the novelty of the invention is a reduction in pitting relative to the performance of the method in the prior art. Applicant then appears to argue that this reduced pitting is an unexpected result. This argument is not persuasive for two reasons. First, no comparative data is presented to demonstrate that the result is, in fact, unexpected. That is, use of the cited prior art method itself in separate experiments might yield equally effective data. With respect to the unexpected results argument itself, applicant’s statement is not evidence and the specification lacks comparative data. MPEP 716.01(c) makes clear that

“The arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. In re Schulze , 346 F.2d 600, 602, 145 USPQ 716, 718 (CCPA 1965). Examples of attorney statements which are not evidence and which must be supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration include statements regarding unexpected results, commercial success, solution of a long - felt need, inoperability of the prior art, invention before the date of the reference, and allegations that the author(s) of the prior art derived the disclosed subject matter from the applicant.”

Here, the statements regarding any potential unexpected results must be demonstrated, not simply argued. Second, the claims are not written to be commensurate in scope to any asserted unexpected result where the claims would be limited to the particular elements required for unexpected results.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1637

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Fredman whose telephone number is 703-308-6568. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 703-308-1119. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3014 for regular communications and 703-305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Application/Control Number: 09/811,143
Art Unit: 1637

Page 10



Jeffrey Fredman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1637

November 12, 2002